



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,109	12/07/1999	DARRYL E. RUBIN	03797.81487	7310

28319 7590 10/03/2003

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

8/13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/457,019

Applicant(s)

HANNERT, LYNN F.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9 & 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 07/21/2003 to the original application filed 12/07/1999; IDS filed 06/23 and 07/21/2003.
2. Claims 1-18 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 4-5 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 06/23/2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Only U.S patents were provided. Applicant is required to provide all publications listed on the information disclosure statement (paper # 9).

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Finseth et al.**
(U.S. 6,271,840).

As to independent claim 1, Finseth discloses a computer user interface (*user interface*; col. 2, lines 36-48) comprising:

- a plurality of document pages (*web pages*; col. 9, lines 19-39 & fig. 6);
- at least one of the document pages including at least one link (*hyperlinks*; col. 9, lines 19-39 & fig. 6).
- at least one of the links having a property that indicates a display format for at least a respective one of the links (*media information present at the associated URL... format information regarding the web pages present at the URLs; abstract*); and
- the display format of the at least one respective link being based on the property indicating the display format (*The user interface 112 can also pass the image scale and format information... then transmits the formatted and rendered web pages 38 in its response 114 to the browser user interface 96 and ultimately to the user 90; col. 7, lines 33-53*).

As to dependent claim 2, Finseth discloses teach the display format of the at least one respective link is based upon an examination of the content of the at least one respective link's target document (*col. 7, lines 33-53*).

As to dependent claim 3, Finseth discloses discloses at least one of the links has a property indicating the display update latency of the at least one of the links (*fig. 3*).

As to independent claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full.

However, claim 4 further recites “in response to activation of a first link by user; navigating to a document page and display the document page in a first display format; and in response to activation of a second link by user, the second link being different than the first link and linking the same page linked to by the first link, navigating to the link-to document page and display the document page in a second display format, the second display format being different than the first display format .”

Finesth discloses in response to activation of a first link by user; navigating to a document page and display the document page in a first display; and in response to activation of a second link by user, the second link being different than the first link and linking the same page linked to by the first link, navigating to the link-to document page and display the document page in a second display format, the second display format being different than the first display format *(the user 90 requests and receives information 92... search the web for the available connections and resources, or by executing upon a list of URLs... The search engine user interface 112 then transmits the formatted and rendered web pages 38 in its response 114 to the browser user interface 96 and ultimately to the user 90; col.7, lines 14-53).*

Independent claim 5 is directed to a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for implementing the computer user interface of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 6, Finesth discloses displaying, in a display frame in a linked-from document page, information about a linked-to document *(fig. 6)*.

As to dependent claim 7, Finesth discloses displaying, in a display frame in a linked-from document page, content of a linked to document (*col.9, line 19-col.10, line 47*).

As to dependent claim 8, Finesth discloses updating the display of the linked-to content at a rate specified by a property of the link linking the linked-from and linked-to document pages (*col.9, line 19-col.10, line 47*).

As to dependent claim 9, Finesth discloses using heuristics to automatically provide most-likely-to-use links to additional material (*col.2, lines 26-65*).

As to dependent claim 10, Finesth discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents previously navigated to by the user (*col.7, lines 13-53*).

As to dependent claim 11, Finesth discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents having subject matter similar to a document being viewed by the user (*col.7, lines 13-53*).

As to dependent claim 12, Finesth discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents created by an author who is the same as the author of a document being viewed by the user (*col.2, lines 26-65*).

As to dependent claim 13, Finesth discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents created during a first time period substantially the same as a time period during which a document being viewed by the user was created (*col.2, lines 26-65*).

As to dependent claim 14, Finesth discloses using heuristics to automatically provide a set of command choices the (*col.7, lines 13-53*).

As to dependent claim 15, Finesth discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based upon analysis of the user's current document context (*col.7, lines 13-53*).

As to dependent claim 16, Finesth discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based upon a set of commands recently invoked by the user (*col.7, lines 13-53*).

As to dependent claim 17, Finesth discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based upon commands the user has invoked most frequently in the past from contexts substantially the same as the user's current context (*col.5, lines 9-52*).

As to dependent claim 18, Finesth discloses displaying at least one link within an e-mail message document page, the associated link, upon activation, causing command code to be executed to perform an operation selected from the group consisting of: reply, reply to all, forward, and delete (*col.4, lines 40-67*).

Response to Arguments

5. Responsive to arguments set forth in Applicant's amendment A (paper #10), the Examiner has reconsidered and withdrawn the rejection set forth in the previous office action.

Applicant argues that "*Applicants note that Koppolu qualifies as prior art to the instant application pursuant to 35 USC § 102 (e)... Koppolu may not be used to reject the claims of the instant application USC § 103*". (Remarks; page 11)

The Examiner agrees. However, the Examiner believes that Finseth, as set forth in the rejection above, meets the limitations as broadly claimed in the application.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-5403 for regular communications and (703) 308-5403 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Contact Information:

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:


AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.
OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872-9306.
NON OFFICIAL faxes should be sent to (703) 746-7240.

Art Unit: 2176

All OFFICIAL faxes will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. The date of entry will correspond to the actual FAX reception date unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal Holiday within the District of Columbia, in which case the official date of receipt will be the next business day. The application file will be promptly forwarded to the Examiner unless the application file must be sent to another area of the Office, e.g., Finance Division for fee charging, etc.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist). All hand-delivered responses will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. Please do not hand deliver responses directly to the Examiner.

Maikhanh Nguyen
September 29, 2003


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100